



REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 8 stand rejected in the Final Office Action. Claims 1 and 8 are amended with this Reply. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1, 7, and 8 remain pending.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in the specification as originally filed, for example at page 6, the paragraph bridging to page 7. The amendment to claim 8 is formal in nature. Because no new matter is introduced by the amendments, Applicants respectfully request their entry.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 36 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skill in the art to make or use the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

The claims have been amended to more precisely state the process steps for printing the solution of thin film material through an ink-jet nozzle to form the sensor device. Furthermore, Applicants have deleted reference to the “material selected from the group consisting of enzymes, antibodies and artificially synthesized molecules.” Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are enabled by the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.



CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants believe that claims 1, 7, and 8 are in an allowable condition and respectfully request an early notice of such allowance. Alternatively, Applicants respectfully request an Advisory Action stating whether such amendments may be entered and considered at this time. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if that would be helpful to resolving any issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

Aug 26, 2002

By: _____

G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344
Attorneys for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600